Appl. No. 09/841,582

Amdt. Dated March 2, 2009

Reply to Office Action of August 29, 2008

REMARKS

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the prior art rejections set forth by

the Examiner under 35 USC sections 102 and 103. Applicants respectfully submit that the

claims as now modified clearly distinguish over the references of record cited by the Examiner.

More specifically, Applicants have carefully considered the remarks and analysis of the

Examiner with respect to the previously presented claims and the references of record cited by

the Examiner. By this amendment, Applicants have modified the claims only for the purpose

of eliminating the issue raised by the Examiner concerning the product by process limitations

which the Examiner asserted prevented the language relating to the adhesive material from

being given patentable weight.

Applicants have modified independent claim 6 to specifically require that the adhesive

layer of material is comprised of a material which loses its adhesive characteristics upon

application of a specified treatment. Applicants also note that claim 10 which is dependent on

claim 6 further specifies that: the adhesive properties of said adhesive sheet are released upon

the application of ultra violet light.

Applicants respectfully submit that these modifications eliminate the product by

process issue raised by the Examiner as Applicants have now clearly specified the

characteristics of the adhesive material layer which is specified in the independent claim.

Applicants submit that neither Camien nor any of the remaining references of record teach or

suggest this advance in the art. Specifically in regard to the Camien reference, Applicants note

that the Camien reference describes securing individual dies "face-down onto [an] epoxy drop"

and thereafter removing "any epoxy from circuit side of die." See, for example, steps 2 and 9

described in column 4 at lines 30-45 of the Camien reference cited by the Examiner.

4

Appl. No. 09/841,582

Amdt. Dated March 2, 2009

Reply to Office Action of August 29, 2008

Applicants note that the present inventors have overcome the shortcomings and

deficiencies of the prior art by providing a convenient technique for creating a so-called

pseudo-wafer which enables convenient simultaneous processing of a number of known good

die thereby eliminating processing inefficiency associated with the processing of defective

chips in the manufacture of semiconductor devices. In contrast with the cited prior art which

requires separate steps of applying epoxy, placing chips on the surface to which the epoxy is

applied and thereafter removing the epoxy, the present invention entirely eliminates the need to

separately remove the epoxy from the chips. This is due to the fact that the treatment applied

to the adhesive layer enables the convenient removal of the pseudo-wafer from the substrate

without requiring the removal of any adhesive residue.

Accordingly, in light of the foregoing, Applicants submit that the modified limitations

should be given patentable weight and the claims should be allowed because the prior art does

not teach or suggest such a structure. Applicants therefore submit that all claims now stand in

condition for allowance.

Data

Respectfully submitted,

Robert J. Depke, Reg. No. 37,607

ROCKEY DEPKE & LYONS, LLC.

233 S. Wacker Drive, Suite 5450

Chicago, Illinois 60606

Tel: (312) 277-2006

**Attorneys for Applicant** 

5